UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,697	12/30/2003	Wolfgang Kalthoff	2058.235US1	2888

50400   7590   02/19/2009
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/SAP
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
BADAWI, SHERIEF

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _25 November 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-3,6-11 and 14-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-3,6-11 and 14-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The Amendment filed on November 25, 2008 has been received and entered. Application

10/747,697, Claims 1-3, 6-11, 14-20 are now pending.

Response to Amendment

2.   Applicants Amendment did not overcome the previous, 35 USC 103 rejection.

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 9 have been considered and are not

persuasive.

4.   This office action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-3, 6-11 and 14-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Rauen (20040015408) Published January 22, 2004 in view of Huff (US 2002/0194033) Published

December 19, 2002 and further in view of Davis et al (20040158471) filed February 10, 2003.

As per independent **claims 1 and 9**, Rauen teaches the limitations as follows:

receiving data inputted in a data entry format by a user through a user interface; transforming the data from the data entry format to a first data storage format; **(See Paragaph.388. Paragaph.708, wherein data format is inputted and translated; as taught by Rauen)**

identifying an error in the data in the first data storage format, the error belonging a particular type of error; **(See Paragaph.570, wherein an error is identified based on validation of data format; as taught by Rauen)**

routing the data to a selected one of first and second error corrections based on the type of the error **(See Paragaph.583-589, wherein error handlers rout the errors to the method that can handle the error; as taught by Rauen)**

receiving corrected data from the selected one of the first and second error correctors **(See Paragaph.591, wherein corrected document is returned; as taught by Rauen);**

and storing the corrected data in the first database in the first data storage format. **(SeeParagaph.388. Paragaph.708, figure 25, wherein data is loaded in the database; as taught by Rauen)**

However Rauen fails to expressly disclose: Wherein the data stored in the data entry format excludes information required by a data entry rule, and wherein the data in the first data storage format includes the information required by the data entry rule.

On the other hand Huff discloses wherein the data stored in the data entry format excludes information required by a data entry rule, and wherein the data in the first data storage format includes the information required by the data entry rule; (See Paragaph.43, which fills in required fields when transforming the data from the initial format in which the data was stored to the universal format; as taught by Huff)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the Huff teaching in the Rauen system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to provide these features to prevent missing data. In addition, both of the references (Rauen and Huff) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, managing data content. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

receiving data identifying a user who input the data via the interface; (See Paragraph.139, wherein a user login to the system is disclosed; as taught by Rauen)

However the combination of Rauen and Huff fails to disclose deriving additional data to be stored in the first data storage format based on the inputted data and based on the identity of the user; storing the additional data in the first database;

On the other hand Davis discloses deriving additional data to be stored in the first data storage format based on the inputted data and based on the identity of the user; (See Paragpah.45, wherein user additional preferences are retrieved based on the login and input values; as taught by Davis) storing the additional data in the first database; (See Paragaph.45, wherein the additional preferences can be stored in the database; as taught by Davis)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the Davis teaching in the combined Rauen and Huff system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated retrieve additional user information to customize the input fields and interface. In addition, both of the references (Rauen, Huff and Davis) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor,

such as, managing user interface content. This close relation between both of the references highly

suggests an expectation of success.

As per dependent **claims 2 and 10**, *the rejection of claim 1 is hereby incorporated by reference;* the

combination of Rauen, Huff and Davis discloses wherein the transformation is performed by a

rules-based procedure. **(See Paragraph.388 teaches using a mapping which is a rules-based**

procedure using the broadest reasonable interpretation; as taught by Rauen)

As per dependent **claims 3, 7, 11 and 15**, *the rejection of claim 1 is hereby incorporated by reference;* the

combination of Rauen, Huff and Davis discloses further comprising providing default data values in

the user interface to the user. **(See Paragraphs.733 748 and 749; as taught by Rauen)**

As per dependent **claims 6 and 14**, *the rejection of claim 1 is hereby incorporated by reference;* the

combination of Rauen, Huff and Davis discloses further comprising defining dynamically the data

entry format based on the identity of the user; **(See Paragraph.807 teaches a user profile for**

storing the language of the user which intern is used to selected the data entry format; as

taught by Rauen)

As per dependent **claims 8 and 16**, , *the rejection of claim 1 is hereby incorporated by reference;* the

combination of Rauen, Huff and Davis discloses further comprising: transforming the data from

the data entry format to a second data storage format; and storing the data in a second database

in the data storage format. **(See Figure 30 teaches storing data in a second storage format(another language) and storing it in a second data base; as taught by Rauen)**

6.   Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Rauen (20040015408) Published January 22, 2004 in view of Huff (US 2002/0194033) Published December 19, 2002 and further in view of Davis et al (20040158471) filed February 10, 2003 as applied to claims 1-3, 6-11 and 14-16 above and further in view of Barr (US 5182705) Patented January 26, 1993

        As per dependent **Claims 17 and 19** , the rejection of claim 1 is hereby incorporated by reference; the combination of Rauen Huff and Davis fails to disclose monitoring a workload of the first and second error correctors; and shifting error handling responsibilities from the first error corrector to a different error corrector in response to detecting that the workload of the first error corrector is higher than a desired workload.

        On the other hand Barr teaches monitoring a workload of the first and second error correctors; and shifting error handling responsibilities from the first error corrector to a different error corrector in response to detecting that the workload of the first error corrector is higher than a desired workload **(See Column. 61, the caseload monitoring function being used to maintain a balanced workload, inherently includes workers with more work then the average not getting assigned cases, and instead those cases being shifted to those with a lower workload. The reassignment function also provides a means for shifting work from one employee to another; as taught by Barr)**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the Barr teaching in the combined Rauen, Huff and Davis system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to provides the advantage of an organized and automated workflow management system to make work more efficient. In addition, both of the references (Rauen, Huff, Davis and Barr) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, managing user electronic content. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

As per dependent **Claims 18 and 20**, the rejection of claim 1 is hereby incorporated by reference; the combination of Rauen Huff, Davis and Barr discloses determining a desired timeframe for resolving the error; and sending a reminder to the selected one of the first and second error correctors, the reminder including a request to resolve the error by the desired timeframe; **(See Column.61, lines 25-35, wherein a timeframe for resolving an issue is determined and reminders are sent to resolve the issue; as taught by Barr)**

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed on 11/25/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant made the following arguments:

I)   Applicant argues on page 6 of the arguments with respect to claims 1 and 9 that Davis reference fails to disclose "Deriving additional data".

Examiner respectfully disagrees, the process of translating the data from one language to another is defiantly a form of deriving additional data since the translated

language is not initially available in the data source, and since <u>translation from one language</u> <u>to another is never word for word, nouns, verbs, and sentence structure and arrangements</u> <u>must be adjusted to suite the destination language which must differ in structure then the</u> <u>source language, therefore to perfect the translation additional data must be derived to</u> <u>output a sound and a reasonable translation</u>. In addition the system performs the translation based on the users profile and identity described. In examining the claims broadly, the term derive is interpreted to mean "*to trace or obtain from a source or origin*" and Davis system defiantly obtains the translation from utilizing the source language and further derives additional information pertaining to the language that the source data or language needs to be translated into from the users own profile or identity defined on the system. Therefore the step of deriving the translated data is obtained and must depend on both the input (which is the received message disclosed in Davis) and the users identity (which is the user profile disclosed in Davis)

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. See PTO-Form 892 for listed of cited references.

Point of Contact

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to SHERIEF BADAWI whose telephone number is (571)272-9782. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30-5:00, Alt Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like

assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/   /Sherief Badawi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167   Examiner, Art Unit 2167
                                                         1-12-2009

/lsw/
13 February 2009